Appl. No.

09/965,589

Filed

**September 26, 2001** 

#### **REMARKS**

Claims 2-8 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 9, 13, and 14 have been amended. Claims 1, and 9-14 are now pending in this application. Support for the amendments is found in the existing claims and the specification as discussed below. Accordingly, the amendments do not constitute the addition of new matter. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

# Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s) has possession of the claimed invention at the time that the application was filed.

The Examiner asserts that there is insufficient support for the amendments to claims 1 and 8 which were presented in Paper No. 9.

In response, Applicants have cancelled claim 8 and have again amended claim 1.

Applicants point to support for the present amendments to claim 1 in the present specification at page 8, line 11 and at page 8, line 17 to page 9, line 9, especially page 9, line 2. Claim 1 as amended is believed to be fully supported by the specification and free of the art of record.

In view of Applicants' amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the above ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

## Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

This ground of rejection is moot in view of Applicants' cancellation of claim 8.

## Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Selby, et al.

The Examiner indicated in the Final Rejection of Paper No. 10 that claims 9-12 would be allowable if --comprising a pair of electrodes and a layer-- was inserted after "device" in claim 9. Applicants have amended claim 9 accordingly. Support for the amendment is found in the

Appl. No.

: 09/965,589

Filed

•

September 26, 2001

present specification at page 16, lines 21-24. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-12 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 13, Applicants have amended claim 13 to recite that the organic electroluminescent material includes a cyclic tertiary amine compound and at least one material selected from a hole injection material, a hole transport material, a luminescent material, an electron injection material and an electron transport material. Support for this amendment is found on page 16, line 25 to page 17, line 1 of the present specification.

In view of Applicants' amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the above ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

In view of Applicants' amendments to the claims and the foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: /fan 5, 2004

Bv:

Che Swyden Chereskin, Ph.D.

Registration No. 41,466

Agent of Record

Customer No. 20,995

(949) 760-0404

H:\DOCS\CSC\TOYAM76\TOYAM76\_AMD2.DOC 122203